DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 236 HE 026 848

AUTHOR Hayes, Mabel E.
TITLE Minority Women in Higher Education: Status and Challenges.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Educational Society (Anaheim, CA, 1990).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); Asian Americans; Blacks; College Administration; College Faculty; Comparable Worth; Doctoral Degrees; Employment Level; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; School Holding Power; Sex Differences; *Sex Discrimination; Teacher Salaries; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Faculty)

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the status of minority women in higher education in relation to recruitment, retention, fair employment, and equity. Recent research on the American Professoriate showed women made up 27 percent of full-time faculty members and that 10 percent of full- and part-time faculty members are members of a minority. In the California State University system, minority women make up less than 3 percent of all full-time faculty. Minority faculty recruitment and employment have not continued earlier gains due to lowered affirmative action standards, smaller candidate pools, and retention difficulties. Some charge devaluation of minority faculty research and higher teaching loads as causes of low tenure rates. Data on salaries and career tracks (which diverge increasingly at higher ranks) suggest that equity for women does not currently exist. The paper argues that as women rise in the professions, they are stymied by the remaining force of the old social norms that in the past barred women from public life generally. With regard to graduate and professional education, the numbers of Black and Hispanic women in higher education more than doubled from 1966 to 1976 though Black enrollment fell from 1976 to 1986. Of those minority women earning doctorates, a lower percentage than Whites plan careers in academics. (Contains an 18-item bibliography.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MINORITY WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION: STATUS AND CHALLENGES

ED 363 236

Mabel E. Hayes, Ph.D.

University of Southern California

COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY
ANNUAL MEETING, 1990
ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA

HE 026 249

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mabel E. Hayes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MINORITY WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION: STATUS AND CHALLENGES

This paper will attempt to identify, describe, and analyze the status of minority women in higher education in relation to recruitment, retention, fair employment, and equity. Included in this presentation will be a focus on the minority students who are in the pipeline for various higher education degrees. The status of minority women in higher education will be addressed regarding the progress or lack of progress in the above areas.

This paper will also focus on issues relating to the challenges and opportunities minority women in higher education are confronting and will possibly confront in the future involving common and diverse needs, concerns and experiences.

The past decades have been important ones with respect to the status of women in American society, and especially minority women. Questions may be asked, "What has been the real progress of minority faculty women in academia during the several decades?" "To what extent have progress toward equity for minority women faculty been reached?" "What are the challenges at present and prospects for the future? "What are the built-in hazards for minority women populations in their route to the doctorate?"

Much recent literature has proliferated during the past several years to shed light on the status, issues, problems, opportunities and challenges of minority women in higher education. In order to determine the status of minority faculty

women, one must determine where they stand in relation to the majority.

A recent United States Department of Education survey assembled a statistical portrait of the American Professoriate. The data was obtained from 8,383 full-and part-time faculty. The survey, described by the department as the most comprehensive ever undertaken, was the first major study conducted by the National Center of Education since 1963.

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, "The department also released the results of two companion surveys that examined a broad range of faculty issues. One looked at institutional policies on faculty members, while the other examined department heads' attitudes and departmental policies toward faculty members. All the surveys were based on responses from officials at more than 400 two- and four year institutions; the data were then weighted so the results would represent faculty members at 3,159 accredited non-proprietary higher-education institutions. Many of the survey statistics must still be analyzed (Mooney,1990).

Some of the professoriate characteristics described by the survey will be presented such as age, sex, race, salary, and tenure, but other salient characteristics will not be presented in this paper. Following are some of the results of the Education Department's faculty survey:

According to the survey in relation to sex, men made up 73 percent of full-time faculty members and 81 per cent of those at private research institutions, and women made up 27 percent. At public two-year colleges, however, 62 percent were men. Among part-time faculty members, the proportion of men was lower--56 percent.

Regarding race, minority-group members accounted for about 10 percent of full- and part-time faculty members. Asians made up 4 percent, Blacks 3 percent, and American Indians 1 percent. Some groups were better represented in certain disciplines: About 15 percent of the engineering professors at four-year institutions, for example, were Asian, and 4 percent of the humanities professors were Hispanic. No break-downs were given between men and women in these disciplines in this particular reference.

Regarding salary, among full-time faculty members, men at all ranks had higher salaries than did women. It was stated that in the past, such differences have been attributed to the fact that fewer women work in the highest-paying disciplines, and the fact that women may have less seniority than men at the same rank. Full-time professors at private research universities had the highest total income--$74,732, compared with $32,740 for those at liberal-arts colleges. Part-time faculty members earned an average $33,841 from all sources (compared with $48,701 for full-time faculty members). Those in the humanities had the lowest total income-$15,587.

Regarding age, the mean age was 47 for full-time faculty members and 44 for those working part-time. One-fourth of full-time professors at all institutions were 55 or older. The mean age of full-time faculty members varied only slightly by discipline, ranging from 45 to 49; it was highest for faculty members in education and the humanities.

According to Carolyn J. Mooney, (1990) when hiring new faculty members, three-fourths of academic department heads considered teaching quality a key factor, according to the results of the survey. But at universities that grant doctorates, department heads were more concerned about the quality of an applicant's research, only 45 percent considered teaching quality a "very important" factor when hiring new entry-level professors, compared with 73 percent who viewed the quality of research in such terms.

In evaluating candidates for tenure, those same chairmen put more emphasis on teaching quality, which was cited as very important by 68 percent. But the proportion who considered the quality of research a key factor was still higher--84 percent.

According to Mooney, the data are expected to be used by administrators and researchers who have been eager for information that would help them deal with a wide range of policy issues involving faculty members. Such issues include an expected faculty shortage, the use of part-time faculty members, the effects of the ending of mandatory retirement for professors, and the need to recruit more female and minority professors.

Status of Minority Women Recruitment and Retention

The tenured faculties at most of our public postsecondary institutions are mostly white and male. Even at the instructor and assistant professor levels, the percentage of minority faculty is lower than the already low percentage of minority students. When one includes tenured faculty at the associate and full professor ranks, the minority percentage drops further King (1987)

Much of the research reporting on recruitment and retention do not differentiate between males and females when addressing minority employment. However, when we see that minorities as a whole are poorly represented at the higher education institutions, it can be inferred that females are poorly represented also.

According to the statistics from CPEC, the percentage of Black faculty at California State Universities remained at 2.6% between 1981 and 1983. In the tenure ranks, the percentage of Blacks decreased from 2.5 to 2.3%. For Hispanics, there was a slight increase in the overall faculty and tenure ranks, from 3.1% and 2.4% to 2.8%, respectively. The percentage of ethnic faculty at the University of California is also disturbingly low.

According to the 1987 data from the California State University (CSU) Chancellor's Office regarding CSU systemwide full-time faculty by tenure status, sex, and ethnicity, indicated the following:

Out of a total of 8,685 full-time tenured faculty, Black females comprised .68 percent (59), Hispanic females .64 percent (56), Asian females 1.00 percent (87), and American Indian females .10 percent (9). The total White females made up 17.52 percent (1,522). When one looks at progress, one can see that the percentage of tenured minority females in the CSU system is miniscule compared to the total tenured population.

The conditions in private institutions are no different from those in our public colleges and universities. In 1976, for example, Stanford University had 23 Black faculty members. Today, 1987, the figure is 24 out of the school's 1,100-members faculty (King, 1987)

Current data from another private institution, USC, for the period 1988-89 indicate that there are a total of 2,398 faculty, with 322 being minority faculty. The 322 make-up include 23 Black males, 19 Black females; 34 Hispanic males, 15 Hispanic females; 168 Asian males, 63 Asian females and American Indians male or female, zero.

Blackwell (1989), states that in 1975, African Americans comprised 4.4 percent of all full-time faculty positions in American institutions; Hispanics 1.4 percent; Native Americans 0.2 percent; and Asians, 2.2 percent. According to data from 1985 (the last complete year for which data is available), the percentage of Native Americans has risen to 03; Hispanic faculty represent 1.7 percent; and Asian faculty constitute 3.9 percent. African-Americans make up only 4.0 percent of full-time faculty and a mere 1 percent of the faculty at predominantly White institutions.

In professional schools, such as medical colleges and universities, African-Americans comprise 1.7 percent of total faculty, a figure bolstered by the four predominantly African-American institutions that maintain medical colleges. In effect, White persons now represent 90 percent of the entire teaching force in American colleges and universities.

When addressing the need to increase the percentage of minority faculty members, many institutions contend that there are not enough eligible minorities. National Statistics tend to confirm this notion. Not only is the pool of minority graduate

students and candidates for faculty employment small, but it is concentrated in a few disciplines. For example, of the nations' 2,551 doctorates in engineering (one of the high demand fields), in 1980-81 only 24 were Black, 23 Hispanic and five American Indian (Digest of Education Statistics, 1983-84). In the social sciences and education, however, (fields in which the demand for faculty has been declining), 714 Blacks and 192 Hispanics earned doctorates. This problem can only be exacerbated by recent declines in minority graduate enrollment.

Current efforts in minority faculty recruitment and employment do not match the gains made in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Several factors account for this declining interest in faculty diversity. First, federal affirmative action standards have been lowered, reducing the pressure on institutions to comply with affirmative actions plans.

With a small pool of eligible candidates for faculty positions, it is essential that institutions discover effective means to find candidates. CPEC, by legislative mandate, has for several years maintained a data bank of minority talent. Nonetheless, minority recruiting still tends to be haphazard and often dependent upon the personal contacts of a few faculty.

Equally important to increasing minority faculty is the need to develop and retain minority junior faculty. Strenuous demands are made on these faculty by virtue of their minority status. Minority faculty de facto bear a larger share of the advising and counseling responsibility for minority students than non-minority

counselors, and this activity, which takes time away from their own academic pursuits, is not credited towards professional advancement. Additionally, a major responsibility of minority faculty members is to advise the institution on minority affairs, another time consuming task. Administrators must assume the responsibility for ensuring that an appropriate reward system is created that recognizes these contributions when tenure and promotional decisions are made (King, 1987).

Although not relating directly to minority women, it can be alluded that they are part of the population. The Latino position in reference to recruitment and retention has been addressed by Reyes and Halcon (1988). Reyes and Halcon in their article in the Harvard Educational Review, entitled "Racism in Academia: The Old Wolf Revisited," is that "all is not well in academia."

They state that C. de Paca (1975) reported that there were only about 109 Chicano Ph.D.'s in the United States. The most recent data indicate that full-time Hispanic faculty (including Cubans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans) in higher education institutions as of Fall, 1983, numbered 7,356 (Digest of Education Statistics, 1985-86 and 1987).

In their discussion of the problems of recruitment and promotion of Hispanics and other minorities Reyes and Halcon emphasized that Hispanics feel that they are placed in the "type casting syndrome," which is pervasive in higher education institutions. This is the underlying attitude or belief that

Hispanics only, or should only occupy minority-related positions, such as those in Bilingual Education, Chicano Studies, foreign languages (Spanish), or student support services such as EOP. Another negative consequence of the "typecasting syndrome" is that often the only avenues for Hispanic promotion are in ethnically related fields. A recent report entitled, "The Status of Chicanos/Latinos at the University of California" (Gordon, 1988) bears this out.

Another syndrome mentioned, was the "one-minority-per-pot syndrome". This means that many colleges and universities operate under an unwritten quota system that manifests itself as reluctant to hire more than one minority faculty member per department. Two or three minority faculty may be hired for ethnic studies, bilingual education, or foreign languages, but too often, departments of education, sociology, history, English, or psychology, for example, seldom hire more than one minority per department. According to Reyes, the "one-minority-per-pot syndrome" can apply to administrators as well as faculty.

Arc (1978) and Olivas (1987) argue that this practice of specialized minority hiring for minority slots "is a more formal co-optation of Hispanic concerns...which relieves the institution of the need to integrate throughout their ranks" (Olivas, 1986). The worst part for the few Chicanos in academia is that the typecasting syndrome segregates them in ethnically related professions. Arciniega and Morey (1985), for example, reported that in 1983 only 3.5 percent of the California State University

faculty were Hispanic, and that the majority of those were in ethnic studies departments. Reyes and Halcon also points out that there is the "Brown-on-Brown" research taboo that Hispanic academics or research interests have caused them to endure racial discrimination becaue of devalued research by the institution from a compelling need to lend a dimension of authenticity to the prevailing theories about our communities. Said another way, we want to provide our own perspectives regarding prevailing negative assumptions about our values, culture, and language. This explains our interest in such topics as dropouts, bilingual education, second-language literacy, Chicano literature, and the education of minority students, (Reyes and Halcon 1988).

A problem that minorities face is that devaluing of minority research in promotion and tenure decisions is difficult to prove. Yet many Hispanics, Blacks, and Native Americans cite cases from their own experiences, or that of their colleagues, as examples of unfair evaluation of their research during promotion and tenure reviews (see Blum, 1988, and Fields, 1988).

Lindsey (1988) reported in her article that Hyer (1985) discusses the consistent problems encountered by African-Americans, other minorities and women when evaluated for tenure and/or promotion, teaching, research, and service are the three major evaluation criteria. One problem is that a substantial percentage of these groups engage in teaching and service, more often than white male colleagues. Studies of select comprehensive research universities clearly indicate that women faculty ofter taught more hours a week than men (Austin, 1981).

Research is weighted more heavily in the decision-making process for tenure and promotion. Second, when research is undertaken, often questions are raised about the foci and quality of publishing research concentrating on minorities or women, and particularly in journals focused on such scholarship, is often viewed as peripheral or secondary inquiry. (Lindsey, 1988).

Minority academics will have to work at convincing their institutions that minority faculty are the key to recruitment, retention, and promotion of other minorities, both students and faculty. They will have to press for full incorporation and integration into the various branches of the institution, not just minority slots. Anything less than that will render them powerless to assist other minorities to be more successful through the academic hurdles. Without minority role models at all levels of the educational structure, but especially in the centers of power--the ranks of tenured professors--it will be difficult to convince young Hispanic, Black, and Native American students that they can benefit from higher levels of education.

Equity of Minority Faculty Women

In spite of the greatly increased numbers of women entering the professions, equality between professional men and women is far from accomplished, and especially minority women.

Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) indicate that the career track of aspiring professional women, after the first few years, diverges markedly from that of men. Further, the divergence is most notable at the higher ranks. Only a small percentage of the

higest positions in any profession are held by women. And the general picture is not changing, or only slightly. In effect, a two-tier system of responsibilities and salaries--higher for men, lower for women operates across professional lines.

Aisenberg and Harrington further notes, "What explains the endemic situation?" And why--with women making up one-third or more of the students in most graduate and professional schools--is the two-tier system not yielding automatically to women's increased numbers? The thesis we develop is that, as women rise in the professions, they are stymied at a certain level by the remaining force of the old social norms that in past barred women from public life generally (Aisenberg, 1988).

Within historically African-American colleges, the percentage of women administrators (executives, managers, and staff administrators) increased from about 31% in 1975 to 37% in 1981. Three women were presidents (Hill, 1984: 61, 70, 72). In the same year, the approximately 2,900 African-American administrators in these schools represented about 50% of all African-Americans employed as administrators in higher education in the southern states.

Kaplan and Tinsley (1989) state that there are approximately 3,000 higher education institutions in the United States and of these, women serve as chief executive officers of approximately three hundred, or 10 percent. Ten percent is not a particularly impressive figure under any circumstances, but it must also be remembered that this number includes women who serve as

presidents of women's colleges or of church-related institutions.

Approximately 450 publicly supported state colleges and universities in the country are often characterized as American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) institutions. Within this sector, twenty-six women--a mere 6 percent--are presidents or chancellors of AASCU institutions. This good news for the optimists is that this number, although low, has doubled in the last decade.

Kaplan and Tinsley, (1989) in their article "The Unfinished Agenda: Women in Higher Education Administration," state that even though women are making some progress, the structure of employment in higher education administration have proved remarkedly resistant to change.

According to Kaplan and Tinsley higher education administration has a pyramidal structure and women are clustered at the bottom of the pyramid. Women are far more likely to be staff them line.

In college and university administration, the three positions most often held by women and minorities are registrar, librarians, and director of financial aid. Research also shows us that most women administrators do "women's work" in higher education administration. Women hold the positions in continuing education programs that focus on women or reentry women. Women run the programs that deal with women or minorities as a special constituency, such as women's studies programs, women's resource

centers, developmental skills centers, and special advising centers. Women serve as deans of professional programs in which students are primarily women, such as nursing home economics, and social work programs. They rarely serve as deans of business, engineering or technology. Women, in short, are "clustered" or "tracked" within the structure of employment in our profession.

Graduate and Professional Education of Minority Women

The numbers of African Americans and Hispanics in higher education more than doubled between 1966 and 1976, and their percentages increased substantially. By 1976, Black undergraduate enrollment stood at 10.5 percent of the national total while the corresponding statistics for Hispanics was nearly 3.5 percent (Sudarkasa, 1988).

From 1976 to 1986, however, African American enrollment in higher education dropped precipitously. The rate of growth of Hispanic enrollment also declined, although the number and proportion of Hispanics in higher education continued to rise. Throughout the period, Native Amrican enrollment increased, but their numbers and percentages remained miniscule. What gains there were in minority enrollment over the decade between 1976 and 1986 were attributable to the almost meteoric rise in the numbers of Asian Americans in colleges and universities in many parts of the country. Indeed, so dramatic was this increase that Asians as a whole ceased to be considered an underrepresented minority, by many in higher education, although some of their subgroups continued to be regarded as such (Sudarkasa, 1988).

Payne (1989) relates that although more than two-thirds of the nation's aging professoriate will have to be replaced by the end of the century, the production of African-American Ph.D.'s dropped from 1,095 in 1976 to 820 in 1986. African Americans earned 14 doctorates in engineering in 1986 and a total of 25 in physical science; in sharp contrast, white Americans earned 1,224 engineering doctorates and 2,761 Ph.D.'s in physical science during the same year. In 1986, in areas critical to technological competitiveness in world markets, only one of 355 doctorates awarded nationally in computer science and six of 730 in mathematics went to African Americans.

These numbers take on a more sinister cast in the light of figures that show that less than half of the African-American 1986 Ph.D. recipients planned careers in higher education, as opposed to more than two-thirds of the class of 1975. Thus, the few minorities in the pipeline provide only a decreasing flow of minorities to America's higher education classrooms and research laboratories. This despite the fact that minorities now comprise 21 percent of the U.S. Population, a figure predicted to rise 35 percent by the year 2020.

Data released by the National Research Council (1987) for 1985 doctorate recipients reveal little change from trends evident earlier. In 1985, Black repicients who were U.S. citizens comprised 4.0% of all U.S. citizen doctorate recipients. This percentage is roughly comparable to the 1984 figure of 4.3%, which included both U.S. citizens and permanent residents. The sex difference noted for Black recipients in 1984 was even

stronger in 1985: Black women were awarded 58.4% of doctorate degrees awarded to Black persons, with Black women receiving 6% of doctorate degrees awarded to all women (Horton, 1988).

The disparity in educational attainment between white and minority populations becomes even more striking when one realizes that in 1980, for those 25 and older, California had the seventh highest proportion of college graduates in the nation and the tenth highest percentage of high school graduates (73.6%). Yet, less than one-half of the Hispanic population and only about two-thirds of the Blacks and American Indians aged 25 years and older had completed high school. Moreover, for that same year (1980), 21% of the white population and 31% of the Asian population aged 25 and older had completed at least a bachelor's degree while only 6% of the Hispanic population and 1% of Blacks had done so (King, 1989).

After reviewing the above data and information one can only conclude that if today's graduate students are tomorrow's professors, then our institutions must increase their efforts to reverse the downward trend in minority enrollment in graduate schools and redouble their efforts to ensure parity representation for Hispanics, Blacks and American Indians.

There seems to be some light shining at the "end of the tunnel" for recent research indicates a significant rise in the number of students applying to doctoral programs for the Fall, 1990, as reported by universities across the country (Blum, 1990, The Chronicle of Higher Education).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aisenberg, Nadya and Harrington, Mona. (1981). Women of Academe. Amherst, Mass.: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Blackwell, James E. (1989, Sept.-Oct.). "Mentoring: An Action Strategy for Increasing Minority Faculty." Academe. Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors. Vol. 75, No. 5, p. 8-14.

Blum, Debra. (1990, March 14). "Rise in Applications to Ph.D. Programs Reported at Universities Across the Country. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. XXXVI, No. 26.

Blum, Debra. (1990, Feb. 14). "Universities Where Tenure Candidates Can Review Their Files Say System Has Not Been Undermined. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks: An Assessment. Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976.

Fields, C. M. (1988, May 11). "Hispanics, State's Fastest-Growing Minority, Shut Out of Top Positions at University of California, Leaders Say." The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A9-A10.

Hyer, P. B. (1985). Affirmative Action for Women Faculty: Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions. Journal of Higher Education, 56:3:282-299.

Kaplan, Sheila and Tinsley, Adrian. (1989, Jan.-Feb.). The Unfinished Agenda: Women in Higher Education Administration. Academe.

King, George. (1987, March). Conference Report on Minority Attrition and Retention in Higher Education: Strategies for Change. State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.: Assembly Office of Research, Joint Publications Office.

Lindsay, Beverly. (1988). "Public and Higher Education Policies Influencing African-American Women." Higher Education, 17:563-580.

Mooney, Carolyn. (1990, Feb. 7). "New U.S. Survey Assembles a Statistical Portrait of the American Professionate." The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A15.

Payne, Joyce. (1989, Sept.-Oct.). "Hidden Messages in the Pursuit of Equality." Academe. Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, Vol. 75, No. 5, pp. 19-22.

Pearson, Carol S. et al. (1989). Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education. American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Co.

Reyes, Maria de la Luz and Halcon, John J. (1988, August). "Racism in Academia: The Old Wolf Revisted." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 299-313.

Simone, Angela. (1987). Academic Women: Working Towards Equality. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Tinsley, Adrian et al. (1975). Academic Women, Sex Discrimination and the Law. New York: MLA Commission on the Status of Women, Modern Languages Association.

Tobin, McLean. (1981). The Black Female Ph.D.: Education and Career Development. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Waerdt, Lois Vander. (1982). Affirmative Action in Higher Education: A Sourcebook. New York: Garland Publishing Co., Inc.